

SECURITY INFORMATION

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

14 March 1952

Document No. 805 3PNO CHANGE in Class. ☐☒ DECLASSIFIED

Class. CHANGED TO: TS S C

DDA Memo, 4 Apr 77

Auth: DDA REG. 77/1763

Date: 31 JAN 78 By: RLMEMORANDUMTO: FROM: 

SUBJECT: Proposed Employee Questionnaire

1. From an overall point of view I think the questionnaire is excellent and fulfills a long-felt need for accurate data on employees. It should be recognized, however, that almost identical operations to verify personnel data have been carried out at least twice before, to my personal knowledge, and the results have been discarded as not being satisfactory. There are many employees who have been exposed to these questionnaires and, therefore, this present one should be carefully handled, otherwise a bad effect will be created.

2. There are a number of details which I think should be revised or looked into before the form of the questionnaire is stabilized -- this in view of the fact that this effort to verify personnel data should be, in my opinion, the last and final effort of its kind that can or should be made. Detailed comments follow:

- (a) [Prelude] Paragraph 6. "Are you interested in an overseas position?"

Comment: I believe that the questionnaire should stick to facts which are verifiable and which are of the past, not forecasts of the future. I do not believe that this kind of question should be asked in this kind of questionnaire. Such a question cannot be answered out of context. This comment applies equally to Section XII (See below).

- (b) Section I. Education: In consultation with the staff of the Office of Training, I believe that Paragraph 2 of this section should be revised as follows:

DegreeYearCollegeMajor

(About four lines)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SECURITY INFORMATION

The reasons for this are that graduate degrees do not fit as neatly into the pattern of Bachelor, Master and Doctor as is implied and the year in which each degree is received is important, not alone the year in which the highest degree was received.

- (c) I do not see the reason for asking for the state in which the college is located. Is there some significance for this question?
- (d) The second sentence in parenthesis "Indicate only the major and the name of the college...." is not clear and should be re-phrased.
- (e) I recommend the use of the term "principal minor" rather than "strongest minor".
- (f) Paragraph 3. I recommend separating schooling or training received while in CIA from that received outside of CIA. In other words, the instruction in Paragraph 3 should read as follows:

".....include intelligence training received in the United States or abroad, exclusive of OSS, SSU and/or CIA training." A new section for CIA training should be added, Coordination with CTR.
- (g) Section II. Work Experience. I recommend that there be added to the instruction in Paragraph 1 the following:

"1. Other than CIA, SSU or OSS, or Military (list most recent first)."
- (h) I recommend that there should be an instruction that the section on Work Experience should cover the entire period since graduation from college, or first true job, or the 15 previous years, whichever is shortest.
- (i) Section II. Paragraph 2. I believe this paragraph should be revised as follows:

Instead of "CIA experience", read "CIA, SSU or OSS experience." I also believe that the station or country overseas where duty was performed is of very significant importance.
- (j) Section II, Paragraph 3. I recommend adding boxes for Coordinator of Information and Office of Facts and Figures; also, ESW (Bureau of Economic Warfare).

SECRET

SECURITY INFORMATION

- (k) Section II, Paragraph 5. Not enough space is allowed for special skills.
- (l) Section III, Paragraph 1. I believe that a statement should be made that data is requested only on hobbies or special qualifications that have some relation to the business of intelligence. The hobby of stamp-collecting is not especially significant; nor that of playing a musical instrument.
- (m) Section IV. Foreign Language. I recommend that this entire section be coordinated with the Language Services Division of the Office of Training since new and more precise terminology and criteria for recording degrees of fluency have, I believe, been promulgated by the Chief of that unit, [REDACTED] 25X1A
- (n) Section VI. Area Knowledge. Not enough space is available here. Another box should be provided on each line indicating whether the residence, research or work assignment was an OSS/SSU/CIA assignment, or whether it was for another government agency or private.
- (o) Section VIII. Publications. Not enough space is available.
- (p) Section IX. Inventions. Not enough space is available.
- (q) Section X. CIA Tests. This list is not, I believe, adequate. I recommend adding three more; Office of Training Tests, Foreign Language Training Tests, and Other (specify).
- (r) Section XI. It has been my experience with PHS's and Form 57 which call for data on military service, - much the way in which this section calls for it - that no adequate description of the duties performed can be visualized from a request framed in this way. I recommend re-working this section so that answers will reveal a more adequate picture of the duties involved.
- (s) Section XII. Overseas Assignment. I recommend that this be eliminated. I do not believe that questions depending on opinion should be asked. (See also Paragraph 2,(a), above).

3. Final recommendation is that each paragraph be numbered consecutively, even though the numbers are grouped into sections, thus:

Section I, Paragraph 1, 2; Section II, Paragraph 3, Section III, Paragraph 4, 5, etc.

This makes it easier to locate paragraphs in a lengthy questionnaire.

SECRET